

DANIEL G. BOGDEN  
 United States Attorney  
 District of Nevada  
 Nevada State Bar No. 2137  
 DANIEL D. HOLLINGSWORTH  
 Assistant United States Attorney  
 Nevada State Bar No. 1925  
 United States Attorney's Office  
 333 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Suite 5000  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
 Telephone: 702-388-6336  
 Facsimile: 702-388-6787  
 Email: Daniel.Hollingsworth@usdoj.gov  
 Attorneys for the United States

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

FRANCES M. WEEKS-ANDEREGG,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; CIVIL AIR  
 PATROL FOUNDATION, INC., an Alabama  
 Domestic Non-Profit Corporation d/b/a CIVIL  
 AIR PATROL, INC.; DOES I-XV, inclusive;  
 and ROE BUSINESS ENTITIES I-XV,  
 inclusive,

Defendants.

2:13-CV-00610-GMN-(VCF)

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA'S  
 UNOPPOSED MOTION TO DISMISS THIS  
 CASE WITHOUT PREJUDICE BECAUSE  
 KATHRYNE ALEXINE MCPHERSON WAS  
 ACTING WITHIN THE SCOPE OF HER  
 EMPLOYMENT**

**AND ORDER**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA'S UNOPPOSED MOTION TO DISMISS THIS CASE  
 WITHOUT PREJUDICE BECAUSE KATHRYNE ALEXINE MCPHERSON WAS ACTING  
 WITHIN THE SCOPE OF HER EMPLOYMENT**

The United States of America ("United States"), by and through Daniel G. Bogden, United States Attorney for the District of Nevada, and Daniel D. Hollingsworth, Assistant United States Attorney, and Frances M. Weeks-Anderegg ("Weeks"), by and through John L. Bertoldo and Robert S. Cardenas, Benson, Bertoldo, Baker & Carter, agree to dismiss this case and submit this unopposed motion to

10 November 26, 2013.

/s/ Daniel D. Hollingsworth  
DANIEL D. HOLLINGSWORTH  
Assistant United States Attorney

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

### I. STATEMENT OF CASE

#### A. Procedural History

Frances M. Weeks-Anderegg (“Weeks”) failed to file her administrative claim with the United States Air Force. Weeks filed a Complaint against Kathrynne Alexine McPherson (“McPherson”) and others in Case No. A-13-674735-C, in the District Court, Clark County, State of Nevada, alleging a tortious act occurred on January 24, 2011. Weeks has not served the United States Attorney General and the United States Attorney for the District of Nevada with copies of the Complaint and the Summons. The United States removed the case to this Court (ECF No. 1) and filed the Notice of Substitution (ECF No. 4), the Motion to Dismiss (ECF No.5), the Statement of Removal (ECF No. 6), the Motion to Stay Discover (ECF No. 7), and the Joint Status Report Concerning Removal (ECF No. 8).

This Court substituted the United States of America (“United States”) for McPherson. Order, ECF No. 9. Weeks filed an Objection to Substitution of the United States as Defendant (ECF No. 10), Opposition to the Motion to Stay Discovery (ECF No. 11), and Opposition to Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 12). The United States filed Replies to Weeks’ Objection and Oppositions.

#### B. Statement of Facts

From January 20, 2011, through January 28, 2011, McPherson was serving as a volunteer member of the Civil Air Patrol, performing a mission assigned by the Secretary of the United States Air Force. “The Civil Air Patrol shall be deemed to be an instrumentality of the United States with respect to any act or omission of the Civil Air Patrol, including any member of the Civil Air Patrol, in carrying out a mission assigned by the Secretary of the Air Force.” 10 U.S.C. § 9442(b)(2) McPherson is “deemed to be an instrumentality of the United States with respect to **any act or omission** [as a] member of the Civil Air Patrol ....” 10 U.S.C. § 9442(b)(2) (brackets and emphasis added).

### II. ARGUMENT

This case should be dismissed without prejudice because (1) the parties agree to the dismissal, (2) McPherson was on an air force assigned mission and is deemed to be under the Westfall Act of the Federal

1 Tort Claims pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 9442(b)(2) (“The Civil Air Patrol shall be deemed to be an  
 2 instrumentality of the United States with respect to any act or omission of the Civil Air Patrol, including any  
 3 member of the Civil Air Patrol, in carrying out a mission assigned by the Secretary of the Air Force.”), (3)  
 4 McPherson was acting within the scope of employment, (4) McPherson’s actions were within the Nevada  
 5 State exceptions to the going and coming rule, and (5) Week failed to file an administrative claim.

6 Although the district court has subject matter jurisdiction from statute and case law authorizing  
 7 this Court the exclusive jurisdiction to decide FTCA cases (28 U.S.C. § 1346(b)), it may not have subject  
 8 matter jurisdiction because the Plaintiff failed to obtain a waiver of the United States’ sovereign  
 9 immunity by failing to file an administrative claim with the United States’ agency.

10 [S]overeign immunity is not merely a defense to an action against the United States, but a  
 11 jurisdictional bar .... [S]tatutes that create federal jurisdiction do not, in and of themselves, waive []  
 12 sovereign immunity. Thus, while sovereign immunity can bar jurisdiction, a statute that purports to  
 13 create jurisdiction alone does not necessarily eliminate sovereign immunity .... We have previously  
 14 explained that [i]n an action against the United States, *in addition to* statutory authority granting  
 subject matter jurisdiction, there must be a waiver of sovereign immunity .... Sovereign immunity  
 is grounds for dismissal independent of subject matter jurisdiction. A statute may create subject  
 matter jurisdiction yet not waive sovereign immunity.

15 *Powelson v. United States*, 150 F.3d 1103, 1104-1105 (9th Cir. 1998) (citations and quotation marks  
 16 omitted; italics in the original).

17 One of the jurisdictional requirements to waive the United States’ sovereign immunity is filing  
 18 the administrative claim as required by 28 U.S.C. § 2675(a).

19 An action shall not be instituted upon a claim against the United States for money damages for  
 20 injury or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or  
 21 omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or  
 22 employment, unless the claimant shall have first presented the claim to the appropriate Federal  
 agency and his claim shall have been finally denied by the agency in writing and sent by certified  
 or registered mail.

23 28 U.S.C. § 2675(a)

24 The parties agree to the dismissal of this case without prejudice because no administrative claim  
 25 was filed as required by 28 U.S.C. § 2675(a), which is jurisdictional. *Kwai Fun Wong v. Beebe*, 732 F.3d  
 26 1030, 1044 n.10 (9th 2013); *Brady v. United States*, 211 F.3d 499, 502-03 (9th Cir. 2000).

1 The requirement of an administrative claim is jurisdictional. Because the requirement is jurisdictional,  
 2 it must be strictly adhered to. This is particularly so since the FTCA waives sovereign immunity.  
 Any such waiver must be strictly construed in favor of the United States.

3 *Brady*, 211 F.3d at 205 (citations and quotation marks omitted) (quoting *Jerves v. United States*, 966 F.2d  
 4 517, 521 (9th Cir. 1992). In other words, the district court does not have subject matter jurisdiction since  
 5 the United States' sovereign immunity was not waived because Weeks failed to file an administrative  
 6 claim before bring the civil complaint.

7 Plaintiff ... has failed to comply with that statute's jurisdictional requirement that she file an  
 8 administrative claim. The district court did not err in granting Defendant's motion to dismiss.

9 *Id.* at 503.

10 This case was filed in State Court. The United States Attorney for the District of Nevada certified  
 11 that McPherson was acting within the scope of her employment and removed the case from State Court to  
 12 the United Stated District Court for the District of Nevada. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2679(d)(2).

13 After the case is dismissed without prejudice, Weeks may pursue whatever rights she has under  
 14 28 U.S.C. § 2679(d)(5), which does not spring into existence until this case is dismissed.

15 Whenever an action or proceeding in which the United States is substituted as the party defendant  
 16 under this subsection is dismissed for failure first to present a claim pursuant to section 2675(a) of  
 17 this title, such a claim shall be deemed to be timely presented under section 2401(b) of this title if--  
 (A) the claim would have been timely had it been filed on the date the underlying civil action was  
 18 commenced, and (B) the claim is presented to the appropriate Federal agency within 60 days after  
 dismissal of the civil action.

19 28 U.S.C. § 2679(d)(5).

20 On November 26, 2013, Robert S. Cardenas, counsel for Weeks, agreed to this unopposed motion  
 21 and agreed to the dismissal without prejudice.

### 22 **III. CONCLUSION**

23 Based on (1) the parties' agreement to the dismiss this case without prejudice, (2) the fact and law  
 24 that McPherson was on an air force assigned mission and is deemed to be under the Westfall Act of the  
 25 Federal Tort Claims pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 9442(b)(2) ("The Civil Air Patrol shall be deemed to be an  
 26 instrumentality of the United States with respect to any act or omission of the Civil Air Patrol, including any

1 member of the Civil Air Patrol, in carrying out a mission assigned by the Secretary of the Air Force.”), (3)  
2 the fact and law that McPherson was acting within the scope of employment, (4) the fact and law that  
3 McPherson’s actions were within the Nevada State exceptions to the going and coming rule, and (5) the fact  
4 and law that Week failed to file an administrative claim, this Court should dismiss the case without  
5 prejudice.

6 November 26, 2013.

7 DANIEL G. BOGDEN  
8 United States Attorney

9 /s/ Daniel D. Hollingsworth  
10 DANIEL D. HOLLINGSWORTH  
11 Assistant United States Attorney

12  
13  
14 IT IS SO ORDERED

15  
16   
17 GLORIA M. NAVARRO  
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

19 DATED: December 18, 2013  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26